

call according to claim 13, wherein said state of the alert ringing sound is changed to the state where said alert sound is stopped.

B,
concl.

--19. (Twice Amended) The method of [controlling a status of] informing a user of a received call according to claim 13, wherein said state of the alert ringing sound is changed to the state where a volume level of said alert sound is reduced.--

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 remain in this application having been amended hereby.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 4-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112. second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Claims 4-8 have been amended to more clearly recite what the Applicants regards as the invention. These claims are now submitted as complying with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. second paragraph. Specifically, claims 4 and 5 have been amended to provide proper antecedent basis for the phrase "said operational key."

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 1 and 11-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as being anticipated by Ahlberg et al.

The present invention is directed to a communication apparatus that allows a user to mute the ringing associated with an incoming call without having to shut off the telephone and without having to

momentarily "answer" the call and then hang up. This allows the user to silence the telephone without turning off the phone and risking that a later call will be missed or of potentially insulting the caller by hanging up.

The present invention mutes the ringing but does not change the communication status between the caller and the receiving apparatus.

The claims have been amended to more clearly recite the feature that a user can silence or otherwise change the mode of a ringer without changing the communication status between the telephone and a remote caller.

Ahlberg et al. is directed to a telephone wherein the user can accept a call but place the caller immediately "on hold", while the user completes some task. Ahlberg et al. is clearly intended to change the communication status between the caller and the telephone user. Actuating the hold selection button establishes the call between the parties. (Ahlberg et al., Abstract.) The user then removes the hold on the call and communicates with the caller.

Ahlberg et al. does not show or suggest the present invention because Ahlberg et al. establishes a call, thus changing the communication status between the user and the caller. The user speaks with the caller after placing him temporarily on hold. Ahlberg et al. does not allow the user to avoid the call from the caller while at the same time silencing the ringer.

For at least these reasons Ahlberg et al. does not show or suggest the present invention, as recited in amended claims 1 and 13.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from amended claim 1, which for the reasons set forth hereinabove is thought to be patentably distinct over the cited reference and, for at least those very same reasons, claims 11 and 12 are also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 2-5, 14, 15, and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Ahlberg et al.

For the reasons set forth above, the present invention, as recited in amended claims 1 and 13, is submitted to be patentably distinct over Ahlberg et al. Claims 2-5 depend from amended claim 1 and claims 14, 15, 18, and 19 depend from amended claim 13, which for the reasons set forth hereinabove are thought to be patentably distinct over the cited reference and, for at least those very same reasons, claims 2-5, 14, 15, 18, and 19 are also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claim 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Ahlberg et al. in view of Higuchi et al.

Claim 16 depends from amended claim 13, which for the reasons set forth hereinabove is thought to be patentably distinct over the cited references and, for at least those very same reasons, claim 16 is also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested of the rejection of claims 6-10 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Ahlberg et al. in view of Roeder and Knuth et al.


Claims 6-10 depend from amended claim 1 and claim 17 depends from amended claim 13, which for the reasons set forth hereinabove are thought to be patentably distinct over the cited references and, for at least those very same reasons, claims 6-10 and 17 are also submitted to be patentably distinct thereover.

The prior art made of record but not relied upon has been reviewed and is believed not to impact the patentability of the present invention, as recited in the amended claims.

Accordingly, in view of the amendments made to the claims hereby, as well as the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that a communication terminal for informing a user of a received call from a remote caller by an alert sound, as taught by the present invention and as recited in the amended claims is neither shown nor suggested in any of the cited references, alone or in combination.

Favorable reconsideration is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,


COOPER & DUNHAM LLP
Jay H. Maioli
Reg. No. 27,213

JHM/SJL